OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 043 796			
CH ACC. NO.			
AA 000 631		Sep 70	RIEMAR71

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Andrews, Theodore E.

TITLE
New Directions in Certification. Improving State Leadership in Education.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
ZBQ93300	Washington State Board of Education, Olympia
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
BBB04325	Improving State Leadership in Education

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;2.05		
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY
Washington State Board of Education, Olympia, Washington 98501

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
39p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Certification; Change Agents; *Teacher Certificates; *Instructional Improvement; *Career Planning; Educational Improvement; Performance; Teaching Quality; *State Programs; Leadership

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This study proposes an almost entirely new and innovative program of teacher certification. It is program-centered and performance-centered and points to the opportunity for many people to participate in an effective way for the development and improvement of the teaching profession. Certification as a teacher should be related to one's ability to teach, that is, his or her competence. New certification regulations in the state of Washington are based on four fundamental standards: (1) Professional preparation should continue throughout the career of the practitioner; (2) School organizations, professional associations as well as colleges and universities should be recognized as preparation agencies; (3) Discussions about preparation should be based upon performance--performance in relation to stated objectives in the world of the practitioner; (4) Preparation and career development programs should be individualized. The fundamental concept underlying attempts to develop new processes for certification is that roles in the educational world must change. If new directions in certification become law in the state of Washington, it is believed that the nature of teaching will change, school organization will change, and American education will change. (ON)

GPO 870-390

ED 043 796

NEW DIRECTIONS IN CERTIFICATION

Report of a Study
Sponsored by
The Office of the State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
and State Board of Education
in the State of Washington
and the Project,

Improving State Leadership in Education

Denver, Colorado
September 1970

AA000 631

Prepared by
Theodore E. Andrews
Associate, Division of Teacher Education
and Certification
New York State Education Department

Edited by
Edgar L. Morphet, Project Director
and
Arthur P. Ludka, Assistant Director
Improving State Leadership in Education

Financed by funds provided under the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505)

Single copies of this report may be obtained from
Improving State Leadership in Education
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Further information about the developments discussed in this study
may be obtained from
Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction
and State Board of Education
Olympia, Washington 98501

This material may be reproduced without permission
provided appropriate credit is given to the
project and the sponsoring state

INTRODUCTION

There must be and there will be changes in the programs of teacher education. Probably no other document in the history of Washington education has received such widespread publicity, even national publicity, and such widespread discussion as the famous Fourth Draft.

It proposes an almost entirely new and innovative program of teacher education. In fact, one might well call it a revolutionary document of the first magnitude. Basically, it is program-centered and performance-centered and points to the opportunity for many people to participate in an effective way for the development of our profession.

The focus of Ted Andrews' perceptive study is on the evolution of a new "process" for the certification of teachers, yet it also has an underlying theme: the story of how a bureaucratic office of certification functions as a change agent. The movements are complementary; one would not exist without the other. We think Ted has captured the spirit as well as the substance of current developments. His objective-subjective study is most useful to us and we trust will be of interest and value to other states in their efforts to become positive change agents.

We appreciate Mr. Andrews' willingness to come to Washington on five different occasions this last year for extended observation and participation in our efforts to significantly improve teacher preparation. We wish also to thank the New York State Education Department for its interest in Washington's planning as shown in a number of ways, but especially by the time allowed to Ted for his research and writing.

We commend the project leadership of Improving State Leadership in Education for utilizing the case study approach. We appreciate having been selected as one of the "guinea pigs" and look forward to the opportunity to profit from the case studies of activities of the other states.

Louis Bruno
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
State of Washington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.	COMPETENCE AS A BASIS FOR CERTIFICATION.	1
2.	THE PEOPLE	5
3.	PREPARATION SHOULD BE BASED UPON PERFORMANCE	8
4.	PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION SHOULD CONTINUE THROUGHOUT THE CAREER OF THE PRACTITIONER	11
5.	PREPARATION AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD BE INDIVIDUALIZED	14
6.	THE COOPERATION OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IS ESSENTIAL.	15
7.	A QUESTION OF COST	18
8.	AN ADDITIONAL IRRELEVANCY.	20
	FOOTNOTE REFERENCES.	22
APPENDIX:	STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL LEADING TO CERTIFICATION (FOURTH DRAFT).	24

Section One

COMPETENCE AS A BASIS FOR CERTIFICATION

Certification as a teacher should be related to one's ability to teach, that is, his or her competence. This statement is so self-evident that few people would even consider challenging it. All 50 states have evolved a system of certification (licensing teachers) based on the concept that a teaching certificate will be awarded to an individual who has collegiate training (usually a degree), has taken certain professional courses in education, and has had some work with students in a classroom (commonly called student teaching). Some few states require on-the-job experience but no state had established performance standards requiring a classroom teacher to demonstrate his or her competence until September 12, 1968, when the Washington State Board of Education authorized a certificate for an educational staff associate (e.g., school nurses, school psychologists, school social workers, guidance counselors). This action represented a direct and complete endorsement of that concept.

> The State Board of Education will approve programs of preparation...which (1) Are based upon an analysis and a description of the performance expectations for the particular professional role for which the program is designed....[1]*

Typically, regulations for certification and college programs for teacher preparation are a list of required courses. A program attempting to describe teacher performance, however, cannot be established so simply. Washington has decided that the role of the state is to establish a "process" (a system of interlocking steps) rather than a list of specific requirements. Process standards establish patterns for action which may vary in the particulars, allow for constant revision, and are likely to evolve towards continually better programs. Traditional certification standards (rules and regulations) establish unvarying criteria which quickly become outdated and are difficult to change. *The minimum requirements usually become the maximum commitment.*

For instance, the new certification regulations in Washington are based on four fundamental concepts or process standards (which are more fully explored in Sections 3-6):

1. Professional preparation should continue throughout the career of the practitioner.
   Since we live in a changing society, we must expect that the roles as well as the areas of competence demanded of school professional personnel will change; preparation must be seen as a continuing and career-long process. In addition, it is not only unrealistic but also inappropriate to expect the beginning professional to demonstrate all abilities expected of the experienced professional. Therefore, continuing experiences must be provided for the beginning practitioner.

2. School organizations and professional associations as well as colleges and universities should be recognized as preparation agencies.

---

*Footnote references are at the end of the report.

If preparation programs are to be relevant, representatives of all agencies and agents which are affected by or which affect education should participate in isolating areas of competence and professional standards.

3. Discussions about preparation should be based upon performance--performance in relation to stated objectives in the world of the practitioner.
Since it is on-the-job performance which separates the effective from the ineffective professional, preparation experiences should be designed around, or be based upon, performance objectives and behavioral outcomes.

4. Preparation and career development programs should be individualized.
If preparation programs for school professional personnel are to be consistent with what we know about learning and about the individual, preparation programs must permit a person to progress at his own rate and in a manner consistent with his unique learning style and personal characteristics.[2]

It would be helpful to think about those four concepts for a moment. Many questions occur to most people when they start to examine what the State of Washington has done. Typically they ask:

"Does this mean that colleges will have to share their responsibility for the undergraduate preparation of teachers?" It does.

"Does this mean that a person could become a teacher without earning a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree from a college?" It does.

"Does this mean that professional associations and/or unions as well as school districts will have a responsibility for deciding whether a teacher should be certified?" It does.

"Does this mean that there may be many different programs of preparation and that there are no minimum standards that everyone has to meet?" It does.

"Does this mean that we can continue to prepare teachers as we always have done but just put different labels on the package?" It does NOT! This last statement is probably the most exciting and disturbing to people who consider what Washington is doing.

If you look carefully at each of the four process elements, you soon realize that none of these will work unless significant changes take place not only in the administrative structure of the colleges and universities, schools, and professional organizations, but also in the working relationships between and among these groups and most importantly in the ways in which children are taught.

A Harvard professor listened carefully to a description of these ideas, discussed them for several hours, and commented, "At first, I thought Washington had one or two ideas that we could adapt to what we're doing. And they may be helpful, but more is involved. If Washington succeeds, the educational world just won't go around the same way any longer. All of the parts will have to change." That idea, that *roles must change,* is the fundamental concept underlying attempts to develop new processes for certification in the State of Washington.

Most people find it very difficult to understand how programs for the preparation of teachers might operate. At the Washington State Board of Education meeting on June 4-5, 1970, a proposal was accepted which established the first certification program for the preparation of counselors in the Bellevue School District under the criteria of the fourth draft of the *Statement of Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification.** The program is being implemented and many people are watching.

The Setting

Statistics can be misleading, and it is impossible to summarize briefly everything one should understand about Washington. The setting of this certification movement should be constantly remembered. The Pacific Northwest is unlike any other part of the United States and it may be impossible to appreciate the difference without living there. Nonetheless, the following is offered in an attempt to give a quick overview--a set of verbal slides, flashing constantly before the reader:

> Washington Territory created in 1853, non-Indian population numbered 3,965--believed to have more mountain goats than any other state--Dr. Nelson Rounds, Territorial Superintendent of Schools (1872) issued first statistical data: 144 school houses, 222 school districts, 8,290 children of school age, 3,828 children attending school--23.9 million acres of forest--proclaimed a state in 1889--transportation equipment largest manufacturing industry (Boeing, again)--1897 State Board of Education given authority to grant teacher certificates--leads in production of apples, hoppes, rhubarb, late summer potatoes, mint, dry peas, green peas for processing--present population 3,337,627--1969 education statistics: 820,482 students in kindergarten through 12th grade, 40,461 certified personnel, average salary $9,727.00, women outnumber men teacher grades K-12 by about 4 to 3, in only elementary grades ratio about 4 to 1, 26 percent of teachers between 20 and 29 in age, and 26 percent of the teachers over fifty.[3]

People in Washington no doubt feel closer to nature than those in many states. The cities are not quite so urban; the mountains and the rivers are everywhere. There are many conservatives in the State; they speak out often with a volume probably exceeding their numbers. However, many people in Washington would be considered liberal. The difficulty is that both groups are interested in education and each feels its version of the truth should prevail.

The Beginning

How should the pattern of teacher education and certification be changed in light of our current level of knowledge about education and teaching and the range of alternatives available to us at this time? This was the problem the Standards Revision Committee (16 representatives of colleges, schools and professional associations) in the State of Washington considered at its January 18, 1967 meeting. Many educators say that the answer given to that question deserves careful study.

---

*The fourth draft is included in the Appendix.

Certification regulations are dry and lifeless, yet this is a story of idealists and politicians and educators and children. To a great extent the changing certification pattern in Washington is a result of the efforts of Dr. Wendell C. Allen, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Certification. Dr. Allen has created an atmosphere of constructive relationships between the State and colleges and professional teacher organizations and has recruited competent educators to his staff--notably Dr. William Drummond and Dr. Lillian Cady, both Associates for Teacher Education--and created an atmosphere in which professional educators and interested citizens could work together and see their ideas tested before their peers. These people are really "quiet revolutionaries": quiet because they do not scream for change (they see violence as a problem, not a solution), rather they ask, "Why have America's dreams become so inconsistent with its realities?"; revolutionaries because they have concluded that the only hope is a radical change in today's society.

In 1966, Dr. Allen said at the Seattle Conference on the Role of the State Department of Education on Teacher Education:

> There are tremendous forces working toward uniformity and maintenance of status quo in teacher preparation. The state agency should place emphasis in its operation, policy, and spirit on initiation, encouragement and support of inquiries, on experimentation, on the building and testing of new models in teacher preparation and on the development of improved techniques to insure accountability.[4]

This challenge to the Standards Revision Committee, coming only a few months after the Seattle Conference, was an indication of *the desire to not only speak the words but also to play the role.*

The Standards Revision Committee worked hard and developed what is now called the first draft (March 1967) of a proposal for new certification regulations in Washington. These were discussed, studied by a slightly larger circle of educators and rewritten into the second draft (April 1967). This was studied by an even larger group and rewritten, resulting in the third draft (September 1967). This draft was widely distributed through the State and after criticism and comment another revision became the fourth draft (April 1968).

Each of the drafts was reviewed by the Washington State Board of Education. This elected body of 14 laymen has provided helpful suggestions and positive support for the new regulations.

The finish has not yet been written to the evolving change in certification in Washington. The fourth draft which established standards for all remaining teaching and administrative positions is now undergoing another revision and will not be submitted to the State Board of Education before June 1971.

An historical study of all of the factors that have contributed to the present fourth draft might begin as far back as the Progressive movement in the 1930's with the major focus on the efforts of the past five years. To name only a few: the Seattle Conference on the Role of the State Education Department, the Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-STEP), the Project for Orientation and Induction of New Teachers (POINT), the four drafts of certification requirements, the annual teacher education meetings, the Education Professions Development Act

(EPDA) projects, summer workshops, the Training of Trainers of Teachers (TTT) proposals, the Teacher Corps programs, and the Washington Education Association projects.

Such an approach, however, would require several hundred pages and provide so much detail that clarity and understanding of the major issues might be completely lost. Instead, this study will focus on the role of the personnel of the Washington Office of Teacher Education and Certification and the controversies surrounding each of the four process elements.

Section Two

THE PEOPLE

What is the correct role of any state education department? Most people would say its purpose is to provide leadership. But do state education departments always provide leadership? *Most set standards, they regulate, in a sense police, the activities of the educational establishment.* But is that leadership?

Leadership has been defined as, "Getting people to do what you want them to." A better definition might be, "Getting people to want to do what you help them to do." This obviously more difficult approach appears to be the concept of leadership that Dr. Wendell C. Allen has followed in his work as Assistant Superintendent of Teacher Education and Certification in Washington.

Such leadership requiring clearly defined goals operates only in an open environment where trust exists and personal relationships have developed over many years.

Theodore H. White in *The Making of the President, 1960* described the early days of John Kennedy's campaign in the following terms:

> The first ten days were flat and discouraging. The set speeches were ignored...were badly delivered. The advance work...was atrocious and resulted in humiliation for the candidate. In California...he had been badly scheduled, underexposed and badly advised....
>
> But all could be balanced and overweighed by the fact that the candidate had found his voice, had sensed a mood, that struck an attitude to the future and to the onward movement of America that would shape the rest of his campaign. He had come clear to himself and his audience; the sharpness of this single theme was to grow and grow, then communicate itself with the strength of simplicity.[5]

Dr. Allen's doctoral training in guidance at Teachers College, Columbia University (a progressive setting), his teaching career in New Jersey and on Long Island, and his 22 years as Assistant Superintendent and Vice Assistant Commissioner in Washington have all been part of his personal time of testing and of shifting priorities. The commitment to changing the educational system through a "process" approach to certification has become the "single theme."

> In the whole business of projected standards there is no question but that we are trying to change the system; we are trying to change teacher education; we are trying to change education in the schools....We do believe the new standards for preparation of school personnel can contribute to the kind of educational system we need.[6]

The environment that Dr. Allen has created is revealed in a 1970 publication discussing the purposes of teacher education liaison committee visits to colleges. These visits are made for the purpose of approving programs for the preparation of teachers. Programs thus approved enable colleges to recommend students for State certification.

> The committee sees its primary purpose as one of assisting institutions in program development rather than post facto evaluation. It recognizes the unique nature of each college and university in Washington State and hopes to encourage further development in light of that uniqueness. It encourages each institution to meet the guidelines and develop programs in its own way. More specifically, the purposes of the teacher education liaison committee visitations are:
>
> (1) To review programs and clarify institution reports in order to recommend approval;
>
> (2) To encourage program development in relation to State standards;
>
> (3) To help institutions with whatever issues, problems, questions they they have;
>
> (4) To help institutions recognize problems or obstacles to program development and change which may not be obvious from within the institution,
>
> (5) To stimulate future-oriented ideas in program development; and
>
> (6) To exchange information concerning changes, development, new emphases in preparation, etc.[7]

Note the verbs in the above: encourage, stimulate and help.

Another way that leadership is revealed is in the quality of persons that one recruits. Dr. Allen announced to the Standards Revision Committee in his March 14, 1966 memo: "We are fortunate to have secured Bill Drummond, presently Chairman of the Division of Education at George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee, to work on the 'Maryland Project', concerned with beginning teachers." In a recent article submitted to *Phi Delta Kappa*, Dr. Drummond listed values which he holds and which underlie the new approach to certification:

- Every individual is of infinite value.
- Every individual is unique.
- Every individual has a right to become himself.
- Education should help a person become free. (Freedom is the power to choose from among alternatives with the acceptance of the consequences for the choices made.)

- People, given the truth, usually will make wise choices.
- Power (political and economic) must be widely shared among all the people if tyranny is to be avoided.
- Existing political processes can be used for change and, in fact, are our best known means for peaceful change.
- Institutions and agencies are or continue to be valuable only as they help achieve the persistent aspirations of man.
- The good society is the open society.
- People are more important than things.[8]

Since Bill Drummond joined the Washington Staff shortly before the first draft of the new certification regulations was written, the movement in Washington is often identified with these two personalities: Wendell Allen, more patient, (the pipe smoker), less excitable, the elder statesman, the office intellectual; Bill Drummond making people relax with his consistent use of humor, turning questions backwards, "I seem to hear you saying," more approachable, the department change agent. Both write well and clearly (all four drafts were written by them--switching sections from one draft to the other).

In addition to working with Dr. Allen in disseminating information about the suggested changes in certification, Dr. Drummond also has been the director of M-STEP and of the Triple-T projects in Washington. Both projects were concerned with the training of teachers and both included aspects of the new certification regulations as part of their guidelines.

As the efforts in the State of Washington increased so did the need for staff. Early in 1969, Dr. Lillian Cady became an Associate in Teacher Education joining Allen and Drummond. Dr. Cady's dedication to the efforts to achieve a new basis for certification indicates that one does not need to be present from the beginning of an idea to be committed to it completely. Dr. Cady has become the liaison person between and among the schools, colleges and universities and professional associations. She has the responsibility for the programs in Washington funded under the Education Professions Development Act which mandates cooperative programs for the training of teachers.

All three of these people in the Washington office--Allen, Drummond, and Cady--work as *one*. *They* undoubtedly *share the same goals and ideals*.

None of these people, however, is personally responsible for issuing teaching certificates. Miss Boydie Rich, now near retirement, is the personification of certification in the minds of many people in Washington. "If you have a question about certification, call Boydie." Miss Rich has been involved in the efforts towards the establishment of new certification regulations; however, she has not devoted full time to this activity because of her ongoing responsibilities that cannot be neglected. Her first responsibility is to see that the present certification needs in the State of Washington are handled efficiently.

These then are the people from the Washington State Department who have been and are involved in the establishment of new certification regulations in the State of Washington.

E. L. Godkin, editor of *Nation*, wrote many years ago, "There is no nobler nor more fascinating game than the work of changing the opinions of great bodies of men, by inducing them to discard old beliefs and take on new ones or arresting their rush after strange gods.[9]

This is the role that the staff of the Washington office and many others who share their goals are now playing.

Section Three

PREPARATION SHOULD BE BASED UPON PERFORMANCE

Should a teacher be certified on the basis of classroom performance? Many people have criticized present certification systems for their emphasis on inputs (courses a student has taken) without any proof that the courses are related in any way to the student's ability to teach. Critics have asked: Would not a system that analyzed how well a person taught (classroom performance) be better than that now in use? The answer is, "Yes." A pause usually follows and then, "But how?" Washington has attempted to answer this question, but not in a way that most people would expect.

The assumption is that an objective way has been found to analyze what a teacher does and evaluate it on the basis of minimal performance standards. The truth is that the people in Washington do not know how to do that. They believe it is important to analyze what a teacher does in the classroom and that most, if not all, certification programs in the past have neglected this area. They also realize that *what is acceptable performance in one situation would be unacceptable in another*. While rating instruments exist which analyze in an objective fashion teacher-learner performance, the problem remains: How do you evaluate the objective data? Washington is reluctant to establish evaluation standards. It believes that no standard would be appropriate for all situations and that any State standards would tend to lock programs into rigid patterns rather than free educators to promote innovation and change. A required set of performance criteria could be just as moribund as rigid course requirements have been in the past.

The development of techniques to analyze what a teacher does in a classroom in an objective way is a relatively new field. Hundreds of rating instruments exist which vary greatly in their purposes and the ease with which they can be learned. In most, an observer watches a class and checks off on an appropriate instrument whether or not a certain behavior took place (example, teacher or pupil listens to others). The more complex the instrument, the greater the information available on the teacher-learner activities (and the greater the time needed to train observers to use the instrument correctly). Some instruments analyze teacher talk, some pupil talk, others teacher-pupil interaction, others nonverbal bahavior of teachers and pupils, and so on. Almost all of the instruments only describe in an objective way (objective meaning that different observers would all see the same thing, for example, teacher warmth or neatness would be subjective whereas the way a teacher sits or stands would be objective) what happens in a classroom.

One other general approach may be used to analyze performance--that selected by Washington--in terms of measurable behavioral objectives. A behaviorally stated objective is a written, specific set of instructions to the learner demanding that the learner demonstrate certain change in his observable behavior

as evidence that he has, in fact, learned. To put the matter in a single sentence, a well written behavioral objective should specify under what conditions the learning will occur and what specific observable behavior the learner will be performing when demonstrating that he has learned.

The initial attempt to make the analysis of performance part of the Washington certification regulations came largely through the efforts of Dr. Harry Garrison, then principal at Franklin High School, Seattle. He had developed an objective rating scale for analyzing teacher performance while completing his doctoral work at Stanford University. He and Dr. Herbert Hite, then a member of the Washington State University staff, were both members of the Standards Revision Committee. They worked together on a subcommittee that recommended objective criteria as, at least, one criterion in a certification process. Dr. Hite, involved in the Washington certification effort in many ways, later developed a pilot program for performance certification under the M-STEP project which used measurable behavioral objectives. The success of the pilot program led the Standards Revision Committee to an endorsement of behavioral objectives in the third draft of the proposed certification guidelines.

Any state that considers establishing performance criteria for its certification program using rating instruments may find that it has to offer two-month training sessions to give teacher educators even the minimal knowledge needed for this approach. Behavioral objectives, however, are easily explained and quickly learned.

A significant problem in analyzing teacher performance is whether one should focus on what a teacher does in a classroom or what a student does. Those who feel that the emphasis should be on the student maintain that the student is the total purpose of the school system and that to attempt to analyze any other aspect of the situation is irrelevant. Those who prefer to focus on the teacher recognize the importance of the student but feel that the sophistication needed to analyze the individual learning capabilities of each child is so immense that the best approach now is to focus on those attributes of teachers which, based on the current research, appear to help children learn more effectively.

In the third draft of the guidelines for the preparation of school professional personnel leading to certification, the State of Washington included the following under the criteria necessary for the initial Level One Certificate:

> 3. The person describes appropriate objectives for teaching in terms of the performance (behavior) of his pupils. This means that he will have to be able to--
>
> > see his goals for pupils in terms of desired pupil behavior; relate his teaching goals with individual pupil needs and aspirations; help learners to find their own task; acquire and apply the findings of the behavioral sciences with respect to individual and group behavior (help learners assess and evaluate their own performances).
>
> 4. The person preparing to teach demonstrates at a minimal level of competence that he is able to educe appropriate behavior from pupils in school situations. This implies that programs need to be developed which help persons perform certain teaching tasks that are defined and evaluated jointly by college and school organization personnel.[10]

Here the focus is on the student.

The Appendix to the third draft included a description of the Career Teacher Project (Dr. Hite's M-STEP model) at the Bellevue Public Schools and Washington State University as illustrative of how performance standards might work. The emphasis was clearly on behavioral objectives:

> A. Determine Objectives
>
> Task 1. Define "behavioral objective," and list characteristics of behavioral objectives.
>
> Task 2. Distinguish between objectives which are behaviorally stated and those not so stated.
>
> Task 3. Write behavioral objectives for learning activities appropriate to trainee's special field of teaching.
>
> Task 4. Write objectives for own field for cognitive domain of behavior: (a) for knowledge level of behavior, and (b) for higher levels of behavior.[11]

The decision to formally endorse behavioral objectives as a Statewide plan for analyzing teacher performance has been the source of intense criticism from many parts of the teaching profession and led to a revision of the statement in the fourth draft which lessens the emphasis on the word behavior while maintaining the emphasis on performance objectives.

Why did people reject the concept of behavioral objectives? Some of the objections came from those people who view with skepticism any attempt to program people into acceptable behavioral patterns. This is not a valid criticism of the movement in Washington which *attempts to increase personal freedom not limit it,* but the concern is shared by many people. Dr. Edwin Lyle, Dean of the School of Education at Seattle Pacific, a private religious college, indicated that his faculty was generally opposed to placing such a strong emphasis on behaviorism. Dr. Hite recently noted, "I no longer use the term behavioral objective. Instead I ask, 'What evidence will you accept that learning has taken place?'"

An additional problem of working with behavioral objectives is that almost all objectives can be subdivided so that the task of writing objectives, initially easy, goes on and on. Also the more complex the mental operation, the more difficult it is to write an appropriate behavioral objective. For example, *doing* activities are easily described in behavioral terms, but if a teacher wants a child to synthesize, finding appropriate behavioral objectives becomes very difficult. One superintendent reported that in another district the staff began its implementation efforts for developing programs under the fourth draft with an attempt to write behavioral objectives for a music teacher (obviously a relatively easy task, since the duties of the music teacher are behavioral in nature). The district has devoted 200 hours of staff time to this task and it is not yet finished.

A different criticism came from the Washington State Council of Teachers of English:

> We are extremely suspicious of the notion that a behavioralistic definition of teaching performance is either possible or desirable beyond a minimal or rudimentary level. We would agree that certain behavior of a teacher is inadmissible and inexcusable. For example, physically abusing a student, being inarticulate on an ideological level, refusing to take responsibility for leadership in a classroom. But we do not agree that the proper or best ways of behaving as a teacher can be rigorously specified. However much latitude for alternatives is allowed, we believe that behavioristic definition of roles will be restrictive and inhibiting....
>
> Teaching, and especially teaching of English, is much more like creation of an artistic work, except that there is no single "product," no tangible entity to which one can attach specific acts in technological fashion. Teaching involves many complex judgments arrived at and executed in essentially intiutive ways...we cannot say exactly what kinds of knowledge and training a poet or a composer needs; we should not assume that greater precision is possible for prescribing teacher preparation.[12]

The lessened emphasis on behavioral objectives in the fourth draft has not stilled the criticism in Washington. The statement by the Washington English teachers is in response to the fourth draft. Many persons feel that analyzing teacher performance by behavioral objectives is inappropriate. Dr. Allen and his colleagues at this time are not attempting to convince people that behavioral objectives are the only or even the best way to analyze teaching performance. Their concept is that *what goes on in the classroom should be looked at objectively and the objective analysis of that data should be the basis for decision making*, hopefully to improve instruction for children. The significance of the criticism is difficult to judge, but it appears to be very intense. Whether it is possible (or even desirable) for members of the State Office to orient large segments of the educational establishment in Washington in the use of other tools of objective analysis is debatable. There appears to be no such movement underway at this time. One might conclude that the performance aspect of the work undertaken in Washington is the area in which the State is having its most difficult problems in finding general acceptance.

Section Four

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION SHOULD CONTINUE THROUGHOUT THE CAREER OF THE PRACTITIONER

The philosophy behind a career development approach to certification is that all teachers are not equal--they should not all have the same number of students and the same number of classes and the same number of preparations. Some are better than others at some tasks. Schools designed to facilitate student learning will begin by looking anew at teacher assignments. Staff differentiation is the term now commonly used. The career development requirement in the Washington certification proposal deals with the same issue. Staff differentiation, however, usually means the extensive use of paraprofessionals or assistant teachers as well as fully certified personnel. This is not the pattern or the intention of the new certification process in Washington (see Appendix under Certification).

Most states have a two-stage certification process. A person receives an initial-provisional-beginning certificate and after completion of graduate work

or a certain number of years of teaching experience and/or inservice work then receives a permanent-continuing-life certificate. Washington is proposing two additional levels of certification: the preparatory certificate which would legally recognize service in the schools by persons not now legally recognized in most states, (for example, student teachers) and the consultant certificate at the advanced career level which attempts to recognize unique roles that teachers may assume as their professional careers grow and evolve.

The *1967 Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States* presented a plea to State teacher education and certification directors for a concentrated effort to reach agreement on seven areas, one of which was "a simplification of the numbers and names of types of certificates."[13] Considering the national movement to reduce types and levels of certificates, why did Washington decide to propose four levels of certification?

The first draft included the following statement: "To adjust the certification pattern to allow for the emerging participation of school organizations and professional associations in teacher education, a 4-stage teacher certification pattern is being established."[14]

The titles of the four certification levels were different in the first, third, and fourth drafts although the functions of each were similar. The first draft attempted to show clearly which group would have the major responsibility for recommending certification for each of the four levels of certificates. While all decisions would be joint, one group would clearly have a major responsibility at each level.

Another more obvious reason for the inclusion of the career development approach to certification was the conclusion of a study by Dr. Hite, completed in October 1966, on the "Effects of Reduced Loads and Intensive Inservice Training on the Classroom Behavior of Beginning Elementary Teachers." This pilot study was carried out in the spring of 1965 with 28 beginning teachers in the Seattle schools. The purpose of the study was to test and refine instruments for assessing attitudes and classroom behaviors of beginning teachers. Two conclusions from this study were considered by the Standards Revision Committee:

> (1) Beginning teachers appear to decline in quality of teaching performance and in attitudes toward teaching during the first two months of teaching.
>
> (2) Teachers in this study with reduced loads were judged to show substantial improvement in teaching performances at the end of the first semester, while teachers with no reduction in load did not appear to improve.[15]

The realization that the effectiveness of beginning teachers decreased unless their loads were reduced was a significant factor in the decision of the Standards Revision Committee to mandate in the initial certificate recognition that the beginning teacher should serve as a "staff intern" where the duties and responsibilities would be less than those of a teacher serving on a continuing certificate.

An integral part of the career development concept is a reduced load with accompanying released time for beginning teachers. This time would be utilized for the continuing preparation of the teacher--preparation which will in theory and, hopefully, in practice continue through the career of the teacher.[16]

This attempt to establish four forms of certification has met with considerable criticism in Washington. A memorandum to Louis Bruno, State Superintendent of Education, from Certificated Personnel, Newport High School, Bellevue School District (written by Dr. Fred Meitzer) noted the following:

> We are vitally concerned that the action proposed in the Third Draft be stopped because we cannot accept the premise upon which it is based. The objectionable premise is that state certification of personnel for the public schools should recognize different levels of professional activity.
>
> The objectionable term in the premise is *levels*.
>
> It would be desirable to certify personnel according to the *type* of professional service rendered, but not according to the *level* at which the service is performed. It is relatively easy to define objective criteria--as the Third Draft does--to distinguish three *types* of professional activity: (1) teaching, (2) educational services such as counselling or speech and hearing therapy, and (3) administration. It is not so easy to distinguish a level one English teacher from a level two, or a level two Assistant Principal from a level three.
>
> The criteria for distinguishing *levels* outlined in the Third Draft are artificial and irrelevant to the practice of the profession. Administered in good faith according to such criteria, the new regulations would only insure that all three types of personnel would continue their "individualized programs" at colleges and universities until they were ready to retire. Administered in bad faith, the regulations would give local school organizations and colleges a dangerous coercive power over educators. The promise of promotion and the threat of non-renewal of certification at a given level is a candy/club instrument that would require the constant exercise of good faith by every administrator, every school official, and every representative of a college or university to prevent certification from being used as a coercive instrument.
>
> Any plan based on the premise of the third draft--that different *levels* of professional activities should be recognized--would depend on good faith alone to prevent certification from being used as a coercive instrument, just as academic rank is used at some colleges and universities to keep the faculty in line....We reject the premise and are, therefore, opposed to any plan based on it.[17]

It may be noteworthy that the third draft included the description of certificates in a section entitled "Levels of Certification" while the fourth draft includes them under a category called "Forms of Certification." This criticism by Dr. Meitzer which encompasses the difficulty of operating such a system and the problems that might evolve if the groups did not operate in good faith are legitimate concerns.

A greater obstacle is voiced by many people in Washington. They see this part of the proposed plan for certification as an open attempt by the Washington Office of Teacher Education and Certification to institute a basis for merit pay in the Washington school system. Professional educators have consistently objected to forms of merit pay because it has been impossible to develop objective measures to differentiate between those teachers who do and those who do not possess merit. The Washington plan, in operation, would provide the school

system with objective ways to analyze teacher performance. Through the establishment of levels, it would also provide minimum competence levels at various points in a professional career. It is logical that a school system could utilize the same instruments with only slight variations to institute a merit system. For this reason many people feel the attempt to change certification is a subterfuge, that really the only interest the State Office has is in establishing merit pay. This is not true. But the accusation is understandable. Certainly the proposed certification system when operating properly could be the basis for some form of merit evaluation; however, that is not the purpose of the certification system. Moreover, the teachers in Washington have the legally established right to negotiate contracts with the local school districts. No system for merit pay could be adopted that was not approved by the faculty.

Whether or not this objection is justified, it exists so widely in Washington that there has been considerable pressure on the State Office to revise the fourth draft by eliminating the consultant certificate entirely. One suggestion is that the consultant responsibilities be one of the roles that a teacher who holds a continuing certificate might undertake; but this person would not be recognized by the establishment and issuance of a separate certificate. While official hearnings on the fourth draft will be held during the fall and winter of 1970-71, there are indications that the consultant certificate will be reconsidered before the final draft of the new certification regulations is submitted to the State Board of Education.

Section Five

PREPARATION AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD BE INDIVIDUALIZED

The only process criterion that has not caused controversy is that calling for the individualization of instruction. This may be because educators for long periods of time have endorsed that concept. Actually, only in recent years through such efforts in the public schools as the individually prescribed instruction projects and the nongraded schools have significant efforts been made to individualize instruction. Washington wishes to take this one step further. *The rate of progress for each prospective teacher should be individualized.* Ample opportunities should be made available for each teacher to develop and practice distinctive teaching styles. Prospective teachers should find their learning individualized. The fourth draft is replete with examples of how teachers may be prepared. Most of these indicate the necessity for alternative ways to approach roles and the variety of definitions needed for various tasks (see Appendix under Preparation).

The implications for the individualization of programs are yet to be felt. A definitive statement was made by Dr. Hite responding to a question concerning the operation of the M-STEP individualized, performance-based program:

> It seems to me that a major change that might well be made is to change the whole role of the college person who works in the school community. This ought to be a very important person and right now he's bottom man on the totem pole in our institutions, academically. If you beef up this position by providing, you see, teacher-training systems in the school district, for a whole semester or a whole year as a residence period, then some of these things might be done, simply, which are now very complicated, to carry out in the college setting.[18]

Note, Dr. Hite mentioned that the whole system may have to change if individualization actually occurs.

Some people have stated that endorsing individualization of instruction is as difficult as endorsing God, motherhood, and the flag (at least up until a few years ago). The distinction is that the people supporting the new certification process not only endorse the concept of individualization, they expect to see it in operation before programs of preparation are approved. One of the most obvious aspects of any program is whether or not it is individualized. For instance, one could ask a preparatory group: Did all of your students take the same course? How many of your students were pretested? How many of your students were assigned differentiated tasks or learning responsibilities based on their pretest scores? Were students given opportunities to demonstrate their competence? The list could go on; but the answers will quickly tell if the programs are individualized. If they are, present practices in schools and colleges will have changed.

Section Six

THE COOPERATION OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IS ESSENTIAL

Had Washington or any state proposed ten years ago that school organizations and professional associations as well as colleges and universities should be recognized as preparation agencies for teachers there would have been overwhelming and enthusiastic endorsement from almost all parties. Today, however, such proposals compete with teacher association and/or union efforts to achieve professional autonomy and with the rights gained by local teacher organizations in Washington and other states as legally recognized bargaining agents. These local groups have found that "anything" is negotiable. The ideal of cooperation that is fundamental to the fourth draft runs counter to these movements. Groups recently given power may not be anxious to share authority in areas where they may soon have complete control.

Dr. Roy A. Edelfelt, Executive Secretary for the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, was instrumental in planning and holding eight regional conferences in the United States during 1969-70, all of which focused on the development of a teaching profession's act--legislation dealing with professional standards and practices.[19] The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards has developed the model act which it hopes to have passed in some form in the near future in order to give teachers authority over their own profession. The movement in Washington has become part of this broader movement.

The fourth draft attempts to spell out in some detail how the cooperative planning might work (see Appendix under Coordination of Preparation). But even if one accepts as desirable the idea of cooperation and shared responsibility, two very significant problems remain. The first, how would such cooperative ventures work? Ross Reider, President of the Washington State Federation of Teachers (representing approximately 10% of the teaching force in Washington), has written:

> Many of our members are quite concerned with the vagueness of wording in the fourth draft. It calls for a great deal of faith--faith in all agencies

involved. Experience has taught our members not to trust that the schools of education and the local school administrators are sincerely innovative.[20]

Many of the people who are concerned about the implementation of the cooperative arrangements do not believe that the varying groups can work together. They also do not "trust" them to work together for common goals. Each group has differing internal responsibilities and priorities and it is entirely possible that the groups will reflect political considerations rather than become planning groups for quality programs. The second, more crucial type of question also comes at the implementation level, namely: Who are the school organizations? Who are the professional associations? Who are the colleges and universities? Before anyone can cooperate on anything there has to be some general agreement as to who is the proper person or persons to speak for the organization.

Considerable concern has been expressed in Washington over who speaks for the "schools." Some people feel that the Board of Education or its designated representative, most typically a superintendent or principal, would be the proper person to speak for the school. However, a statement prepared by the Washington Education Association (WEA) after holding a series of hearings notes the following:

> The school organization as conceived in the fourth draft is not the school board but those persons appointed by the administrative staff to work with the local professional association and the Institution of Higher Learning in the development of preparation programs in that district.[21]

An equally difficult question is: Who speaks for the professional associations? The past few years in Washington have witnessed increased interest on the part of the specialized professional associations, for instance, teachers of a specific academic subject in playing a major role, if not the only role, in the determination of the minimal performance criteria. Many internal disagreements have occurred. The Washington Education Association has developed a statement which clarifies its position:

> (1) The Washington Education Association, because of its large membership which includes teachers, administrators at all levels, and educational staff associates, must make sure that the concerns of all segments of the profession can be heard. It must guarantee that the professional associations have an equal voice along with colleges and the school administrative staff in developing preparation programs.
>
> The WEA-OCA has cooperated with local associations in naming professional association representatives in each of the pilot projects as each new pilot project is approved.
>
> (2) The professional associations representing specialized groups must play an important role in developing standards for the preparation of these specialized groups. For instance, the counselors have a right to develop statewide standards for the preparation of counselors. These statewide standards must be adaptable to the needs of a particular school district as defined by the local administrative personnel, the local education association, and the cooperating institution of higher learning.

(3) The local education association must be a clearing agency for preparation programs of all certificated personnel in the district. When standards of preparation have been agreed upon with the district, the negotiating group then will establish those standards as district policy by negotiating their adoption just as it now negotiates salary and fringe benefits.[22]

An operating model for such a program has also been prepared by the Washington Education Association. In it the WEA with other specialized professional groups will be responsible for providing its best thinking to the local education association. The local unit which represents the various professional groups is the professional association through which the preparation programs must be coordinated. At the same time the local unit works with the school organization and institutions of higher learning. This position recognizes the local unit as the unit of ultimate authority in the cooperative arrangement as representative of the professional associations. However, it also recognizes the role of both the broad professional group and the specialized professional groups to furnish to the local agency the needed expertise available only through the larger and more broadly representative group.

All of the problems that people perceive may occur. More importantly, however, is the fact that the Washington Education Association Office of Certification and Accreditation published in January 1970 a list of 26 programs already operating for the preparation of teachers in a variety of specific academic specialities throughout the State. All of these programs are based on the concept that the responsibility for planning must be shared among local units, colleges and universities and school districts. The answer to the question--Who represents the schools and who represents the colleges?--and universities?--may be one that will come out of the demonstration projects as each of these groups is forced to consider this question and come to some conclusion. Dr. Cady, who is involved in the projects that are operating under the Education Professions Development Act, has found that some are working quite successfully and others (while they appear to be working successfully) have not had adequate participation by the colleges and universities, for instance.

Recognizing the responsibility of the State Office for the development of cooperative efforts, two staff development coordinators, Kevin MacTavish and Alf Langland, have been appointed. Their primary responsibility is to improve communications and planning among agencies responsible for preparation programs leading to teacher, administrator and educational staff associate certification. Mr. MacTavish is assigned to the Seattle area; Mr. Langland to the Spokane region. A third staff development coordinator will be appointed shortly to the Yakima area.

Western Washington State College and the Auburn School District are developing a cooperative program at the graduate level for intern teachers. One of the issues that had to be resolved was the reluctance of the college to give resident credit required for graduate degrees at that college for service in the Auburn School District. This is only one example of the difficulty of shared responsibilities. Another problem that has occurred in some colleges and universities is the reluctance of the liberal arts faculty to share its authority. They perceive that shared responsibility for the preparation of teachers means that the department of mathematics in a liberal arts college that educates teachers also will have its authority shared with the school district

and a professional association. The liberal arts faculty does not understand why it should share its authority with any of these groups. These problems are real; they are not insurmountable, but they are typical of the ever-expanding issues that have arisen in Washington through the simple and almost generally endorsed concept that the people who are most knowledgeable about the duties of teachers should be those most responsible for their training and certification.

Section Seven

A QUESTION OF COST

What will it cost? This is the first question that occurs to many people when they hear of the certification proposal in Washington. No cost analysis has yet been done to indicate what it will cost. However, all people who have been involved in this program recognize that the cost factor may be significant. For instance, public schools have not to any great extent contributed staff time or facilities or materials to train teachers on an in-service basis. The new regulations would mandate that such activities be undertaken. Also the resolution of the questions of how groups can be made to work together cooperatively and how performance criteria can be established will involve additonal costs. The new regulations that mandate reduced loads for beginning teachers introduce another cost factor. If one recognizes that the cost may be significant, the question that logically follows is where does the money come from? There is no easy answer to this and there never has been. Louis Bruno, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in an address to the Washington Association of School Administrators on May 8, 1970, discussed the financing of education in Washington with a view to the future. The following excerpts from his speech indicate his concern:

> *The key issue before us is tax reform.* Everything else is moot if the people of the state of Washington fail to respond and create a fair, equitable and reasonable tax system....Tax reform provides the only hope on the horizon for improved school support in the 1970's. A more balanced tax source and an equitable tax system must be provided rather than relying on the property tax and sales tax to support education...As of April 30, 1970, more than $167.06 million have been voted for maintenance and operation levies for 1971. The total will exceed $170,000,000 when all levies have been voted--an increase of $40,000,000 over the present year. This speaks well for the citizens of Washington in their desire for good schools, but they are "fed up" with the annual special elections, the unequal property assessments, and the inequities created in their schools by the unequal wealth in their communities....The question arises as to whether educational needs of children can be adequately supported by a state support program regardless of the accident of residence. One of the challenges of the 1970's will be to determine the quality of education to which every child is entitled and then provide sufficient state funds to meet those needs.
>
> In a great measure local support of education is a myth. The attempts to establish local control have generated inequity, a lack of fairness and unequal education....
>
> At this particular point and time in our state financial picture, with the possibility of tax reform making possible close to 80% state support for

public education, the fact becomes clear *what will be needed in the state of Washington is a statewide salary schedule for both certified and classified personnel.*[23]

This commitment by the highest elected official in education in the State of Washington for increased Statewide support for education and a mandated salary scale indicates both his awareness of the financial problems in Washington and his leadership in proposing what may be an unacceptable solution to many people. Also included in this speech was his support for the activities of the personnel in certification.

The realization that Washington faces monetary problems in supporting education does not solve the problem of where the funds will come from to support career development. Dr. Allen has stated that what he is proposing is the establishment of programs under the fourth draft to train teachers for an undetermined period of time in conjunction with the already established programs of preparation. Many of the questions concerning cost of operation will be worked out as the initial programs become operational. He believes that if the programs are deserving of support then the support will be forthcoming. This idealistic concept may well be true. Dr. Allen, with the support of Louis Bruno and the State Board of Education, is attempting to mandate through the State formula a certain percentage of support for local school districts that must be used for staff development. These funds would provide the needed resources to support the implementation of the new certification regulations. Providing several million dollars annually to support local efforts in staff development (through the State aid formula) should greatly increase the support for the new fourth draft.

Industry spends great sums of money training new employees regardless of the employee's previous experience or collegiate training. Yet schools have never accepted the necessity of supporting on-the-job training for new teachers. Some of the criticisms of the school system may be a reflection of this neglect. *Expenditures for staff development in schools are legitimate and appropriate.*

Funds to support staff development may come from many sources. Colleges already budget money for the supervision of student teachers. Under the provisions of the fourth draft, student teaching arrangements will change. The reallocation of funds already committed to teacher education for such purposes as the supervision of student teachers will support to some extent the development of programs under the fourth draft.

Since the new regulations suggest different ways of preparing teachers, it is difficult to anticipate the actual cost. Schools, colleges and universities, and even professional associations and/or unions may develop cooperative hiring patterns; personnel may be used in totally new ways. Many educators feel that state and federal funds should be used for staff development.

Whether State-mandated support will be approved by the legislature is not known at this time. What alternate ways will be found to finance these programs if the money is not forthcoming through mandates is also not known. Both questions remain unanswered: How much will the implementation of the fourth draft cost? Where will the money come from?

Section Eight

AN ADDITIONAL IRRELEVANCY

Considering the problems that Washington has faced, the question must be raised: Will a new certification process become law in Washington?

Not everyone supports the fourth draft. Critics exist:

"There's nothing wrong with the fourth draft that wasn't wrong with the first draft."

"Why replace a bad certification system with one that is worse, more expensive and completely unworkable."

"College staff don't understand it and will never accept it."

"It's too expensive."

"How are you going to do it?"

And also supporters:

"I don't understand it fully, but I like where it is going."

"The only mistake Wendell Allen made was not going to the State Board for action two years ago. We needed these reforms yesterday, not tomorrow."

While many honest concerns do exist, it is reasonable to assume that the fourth draft (as it will be revised) will become law--probably in 1971--not because a State Office has pushed something through that is unacceptable to the professional educators in the State, but because through working with these educators the fourth draft will become acceptable to them.

Many states are now considering moving towards a performance basis for certification. The Florida Department of Education and the U. S. Office of Education sponsored a working clinic in June 1970 on using performance criteria for the certification of teachers. This meeting was attended by teams of representative persons from state agencies and professional associations from 16 states. Each of the 16 states that attended has committed itself to some extent to moving towards a performance basis for certification. Washington was one of the states that attended, but it might be argued that had not Washington moved in this direction several years ago, there would have been no interest from other states. The United States Office of Education through the Education Professions Development Act has encouraged colleges and universities and school districts to work together to develop cooperative programs and has funded the development of several model elementary programs containing strong performance components. Did these come because Washington has been moving in this direction or has Washington's movement been independent of the national movement? That answer is very difficult to determine. Certainly Dr. Wendell Allen has been actively involved in committees of the National Education Association for many years and his efforts are widely known. On the other hand, today's climate and the demand for accountability in education may have forced these movements.

State Departments of Education that are considering the establishment of performance criteria for certification may be looking to Washington for guidance. However, an understanding of what is happening in Washington is meaningless without an understanding of why it happened. Drs. Cady and Allen have written:

> Unless education can meet the challenges and complexities posed by the demands for relevance and change, it is but another symbol of the establishment--a champion of the status quo--an institution open to attack and ridicule--an additional irrelevancy.[24]

The attempt to change the educational system through a change in certification regulations underlies all of the efforts in the State of Washington.

Charles E. Silberman, writing in 1970, considers the problems of education in a similar way: "It is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public schools without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere: mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self."[25] Mr. Silberman nonetheless, believes that schools can be organized to facilitate "joy in learning" and that there are models now in existence.

> What is mostly wrong with the public schools is not due to venality, or indifference, or stupidity, but to mindlessness...it simply never occurs to more than a handful [of teachers, principals and superintendents] to ask *why* they are doing what they are doing--to think seriously or deeply about the purposes or consequences of education....The solution must lie in infusing the various educating institutions with purpose; more important, with thought about purpose, and about the ways in which techniques, content, and organization fulfill or alter purpose.[26]

The movement in Washington may provide Mr. Silberman with a model. No one can plan a teacher education program or assess anyone's teaching performance without beginning by asking: What is it you want done and why? Purpose, the definition of purpose, the discussion of purpose, the exposition of purpose, all must come first. In Washington, cooperative planning agencies must begin with statements of purpose--their objectives, their values. That is how the movement in Washington began. Dr. Drummond has stated, "We are talking about changing the nature of teaching; we are talking about changing the way teachers work with children, we are talking about changing the way schools are organized and much more, we are talking about finding the way America needs to go."

Eric Hoffer wrote in his column recently:

> History will come to an end
> Either when the world becomes a menagerie
> Or when man becomes fully human.
> For history is the history of human effort
> Of man's tortuous ascent through the millenium
> Of his ceaseless effort to break away from the
> rest of creation
> And become an order apart.
> In human affairs every solution serves only to
> sharpen the problem
> To show us more clearly what we are up against.
> There are no final solutions.[27]

The State of Washington does not have a final solution to the question of what is the best way to educate a teacher or what is the best system of certification. But in the past four years Washington has sharpened the problem and shown many people more clearly not only what they are up against, but also the potential for change that is within the structure of American society. All change does not come in violent revolution or from outside traditional sources of political power. In Washington, quiet revolutionaries have been at work. They may succeed.

Footnote References

[1]Memorandum No. 25, State Board of Education Rules and Regulations, Re: Educational Staff Associate Certification (Olympia, Washington: State Board of Education), p. 1.

[2]Wendell C. Allen and William H. Drummond, Statement of Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Fourth Draft (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, April 1968), p. ii.

[3]Annual Report, School Statistics, February 1970 (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1970), pp. 1, 2, 3,.

[4]Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen, eds., The Seattle Conference (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967), p. 82.

[5]Theodore H. White, The Making of the President, 1960 (New York City; Atheneum, 1961), pp. 309-10.

[6]Teacher Education Annual Conference, 1969 (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1969), p. 3.

[7]Wendell Allen, State Board of Education Approval of Programs of Preparation for Elementary and Secondary School Personnel (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1970), p. 1.

[8]William H. Drummond, "The Meaning and Application of Performance Criteria in Staff Development" (article submitted to Phi Delta Kappa, 1970), p. 2.

[9]Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 206.

[10]Wendell C. Allen and William H. Drummond, Guidelines for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Third Draft (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, September 1967), p. 15.

[11]Ibid., p. 29.

[12]"To: Authors of Statement of Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Fourth Draft and Other Persons Responsible for Change in Preparation and Certification Plans that Affect the Teaching of English" Position Paper on Teacher Preparation and Certification, Washington State Council of Teachers of English (Adopted by unanimous agreement of the annual Delegate Assembly, Washington State Council of Teachers of English, May 2, 1970), pp. 2, 3.

[13]T. M. Stinnett, with assistance of Edna N. Frady and Geraldine E. Pershing, A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, 1967 Edition (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1967), pp. 3, 4, 5.

[14]Guidelines and Standards for Programs of Preparation Leading to Teacher Certification (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, March 30, 1967), p. 6.

[15]F. Herbert Hite, Effects of Reduced Loads and Intensive Inservice Training Upon the Classroom Behavior of Beginning Elementary Schools, Research Report 07-08 (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, October 1966), p. 7.

[16]Wendell C. Allen, Lillian V. Cady, and William H. Drummond, "Performance Criteria for Education Personnel Development: A State Approach to Standards," The Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1969, p. 134.

[17]Memorandum: To Louis Bruno, State Superintendent of Education; From: Certified Personnel, Newport High School, Bellevue; Subject: Guidelines for Certification, Third Draft.

[18]Robert C. Burkhart, ed., The Assessment Revolution (Albany, New York: New York State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification and Buffalo State University College, Teacher Learning Center, 1969), pp. 213, 214.

[19]The Profession's Role in Certification, A Conference Report (Albany, New York: New York State Teachers Association, March 1970), p. 15.

[20]Ross Reider, "The Fourth Draft--An Exercise in Futility," Your Public Schools, January 1970, p. 13.

[21]"Teachers Should Have Voice in Education," Your Public Schools, p. 13.

[22]Ibid., p. 13

[23]Louis Bruno, "Looking to the 70's" (speech presented to the Washington Association of School Administration, May 8, 1970), pp. 2, 3.

[24]Lillian V. Cady and Wendell C. Allen, "Preparing Teachers to Meet Change: One State's Approach," Educational Technology, February 1970, p. 71.

[25]Charles E. Silberman, "Murder in the Schoolroom," Atlantic Monthly, June 1970, p. 83.

[26]Ibid., p. 83.

[27]Eric Hoffer, "The Nature of Mankind," Seattle Post-Intelligencer, April 5, 1970, p. 18.

Appendix

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL LEADING TO CERTIFICATION

(F O U R T H D R A F T)

April 1968

INTRODUCTION

The standards established by the state for the preparation of school professional personnel should encourage and facilitate the efficient marshaling of Washington's knowledge and resources to furnish the best quality of preparation. The revised standards attempt to do this by:

1. Placing the primary focus of preparation upon performance. The standards call for preparation experiences to be individualized and organized in some rational and systematic fashion related to professional roles.

2. Extending the responsibility for professional preparation to include the schools and the organizations of school professional personnel, most especially so for intern and continuing career preparation. Colleges and universities will continue their major role in basic preparation. They will have an increased responsibility to collaborate with schools and professional associations in the intern and continuing phases of career preparation.

These two provisions, relating preparation to performance in professional roles and enlarging responsibility for preparation to include schools and professional organizations, make possible putting all our resources to work to meet the state's needs for professional school personnel. This is a new setting in which school responsibility for preparation of staff is recognized and increased; a setting in which the preparation role of general and specialized professional associations is recognized and increased; and a setting in which the coordinating effort of the state will be needed to facilitate the most effective collaboration of these three "preparation agencies".

It is a setting in which the kinds, amount and duration of preparation experiences of each candidate will be an individual determination, requiring assessment and reassessment of many pertinent factors as his preparation and career advances. To say that he will make the major decisions as his career preparation proceeds, is no exaggeration. To say that the major preparation role of the three "preparation agencies" is to assist him in making assessments and decisions, is likewise no exaggeration. The major task of preparation agencies is to provide personal encounters with teaching-learning situations and provide adequate feedback data to the student of teaching so that he can make wise decisions for himself.

In this setting the function of state standards is to establish the types and categories of certification and to provide the ground rules for determining the preparation experiences or encounters. The major functions of the state education agency become those of assisting in the coordination of preparation activities, of making sure that agencies use appropriate processes and procedures, and of providing for the issuance of certificates.

Three kinds of professional roles in the schools furnish the basis for classification of certificates. These roles are: (1) teaching; (2) administration; and (3) professional services other than teaching or administration which contribute to instruction. Within each of these kinds of certificates there may be categories corresponding to specific roles such as mathematics teacher, school principal, and speech terapist.

Each kind of certificate may be issued in four forms, as follows:

A "preparatory" certificate

A certificate to authorize preparatory experiences with children, youth, and adults in school or school-related settings which lead to "initial" certification.

An "initial" certificate

A certificate to authorize initial school service in a particular role as a staff intern, when the person is ready to begin assuming some independent responsibility for clients. The "initial" certificate may be utilized for from one to five years.

A "continuing" certificate

A certificate to authorize school service on a continuing basis, attesting to the fact that the person has shown that he can perform effectively those tasks required of full-fledged professionals.

A "consultant" certificate

A certificate for those who qualify for roles which contribute to professional preparation and to the improvement of instruction. This certificate will be optional; that is, available to persons who hold a "continuing" certificate who desire to qualify. The certificate will be limited to five years of service, but it may be renewed.

The development of professional preparation programs under these standards will call for new working arrangements and for various kinds of participation of the three preparing agencies at each stage of career development. Preparation will require more time, effort, and commitment by candidates and by college and school people than does most preparation today. For these reasons and because more experience and knowledge is needed to ensure steady, successful progress, it is expected that several pilot projects for teacher and administrator preparation will be carried out during the next three years. We expect that these projects will be supported in part by educational personnel development grants from the federal government.

The standards outlined in this document may be a sufficient basis for State Board of Education authorization of certification for educational staff associates. (Educational staff associate is the classification of school professional workers who assist the educational program in roles other than teacher or administrator.) Appropriate certification is not presently provided for several professional roles which come under this certificate type classification.

The standards which are presented in the following pages probably will need technical editing prior to their consideration by the State Board of Education. It should be noted that a number of matters which are covered elsewhere in state law or regulations are not covered in this document. These include the fact that certification regulations can not be retroactive; that is, the validity of any currently held certificate is not changed by new standards; the right of individuals to ask for review of any certification action or to appeal any final action; the bases for revocation of certificates; and general requirements for all certification such as minimum age, citizenship, and health.

Standards for vocational certificates are determined in accordance with the State Plan for Vocational Education. Other standards not included are those for adult education teachers, for substitute and emergency substitute teachers, and for personnel who serve on a temporary or assisting basis.

Standards for community college and college and university faculty are not within the purvue of the State Board of Education.

Wendell C. Allen
Assistant Superintendent for
Teacher Education and Certification

William H. Drummond
Associate for Teacher Education

CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION

Types and Categories
Forms of Certification
Assignment of Personnel

PREPARATION

Steps in Planning Preparation Experiences
1. Role definition
2. Performance expectations or criteria
3. Development of tasks
4. Organization of materials and facilities
5. Models of performance
6. Assessment of readiness
7. Ordering of tasks
8. Scheduling tasks
9. Provision for feedback
10. Recommendation and placement

Career considerations

COORDINATION OF PREPARATION

PROGRAM APPROVAL AND REVIEW

* * * * * * * *

CERTIFICATION

Types and Categories

Three types of certification are provided based upon the three kinds of service performed by professional personnel in the elementary and secondary schools of the state. These kinds of service are: teacher, administrator, specialized assistant (educational staff associate).

Teacher certification (for the primary role of teaching children and youth) is usually in one or two areas of subject matter preparation and for teaching students in one or more age groups. Teaching experience and further preparation may lead to increased specialization.

Administrator certification (for the primary role of general school administration) is for administrative roles such as school principals and superintendents. Currently, there is an elementary, a secondary, and an overall category for school principals.

Educational staff associate certification (for the primary role of specialized assistance to the educational program) is for such roles as: health services; speech and hearing impairment; visual and reading problems; for instructional resources; and for counseling, social work and psychological service.

Specialized preparation is needed for each kind of service. Each kind of service includes a number of fields or areas of preparation which, for purposes of certification, are classified as categories. These areas of preparation and categories of certification correspond to the personnel needs of the schools and thus are subject to change as schools respond to changing educational needs. Preparation is developed in response to these needs, and new categories within the appropriate certificate are then recognized.

Forms of Certification

Each type of certificate relates to career development, as follows:

Preparatory certificate

A certificate to authorize preparatory experiences with children, youth, and adults in school or school-related settings which lead to "initial" certification. This certificate may be issued for a period of one year. It may be renewed.

Initial certificate

A certificate which authorizes initial school service in a particular role as a staff intern, when the person is ready to begin assuming some independent responsibility for clients. This certificate may be issued for a period of one to five years.

Continuing certificate

A certificate which authorizes school service on a continuing or career basis. It would be subject to renewal should a holder leave educational service for a period of five years or more.

Consultant certificate

A certificate for those who qualify for roles which contribute to the professional preparation and to the improvement of instruction. This certificate is optional; that is, available to persons who hold a continuing certificate, who desire to qualify. The certificate will be limited to five years of service. It may be renewed.

Assignment of Personnel

Certification provides a basis for and is adaptable to differentiation in professional roles. The kinds and categories of certification relate to qualifications for professional roles in the schools.

Thus, determination of assignments is approached as a function of initial and continuing preparation. For example; Initial certification as a staff intern calls for a limited assignment and special supervision as compared with that of a person with Continuing certification. Career (continuing) certification calls for continuing preparation for the same role and, if the individual desires, for a different role. Consultant certification relates to a specific role and calls for continuing preparation in the specific role.

Assignment of personnel should be based upon the person's ability and readiness to perform successfully the tasks contemplated after assignment is made. Continued in-service resources should be provided to assist the professional in

improving or increasing the quality of his services. Such assistance should be systematic; that is, it should be based upon clear and agreed upon objectives, periodic assessment of performance--followed each time by non-threatening feedback and support.

PREPARATION

Steps in planning preparation experiences

The preparation of professional personnel based upon performance assumes a rational planning sequence or process:

1. Role definition. The preparation of professional personnel such as the elementary teacher, the guidance and counseling worker, or the school administrator, presupposes some idea of what the elementary teacher, the counselor, or the school administrator, actually does or should do. Role definitions should include consideration of both what is and what ought to be. Concerns of school organizations and their patrons, of professional associations, and of colleges and universities, should be revealed through role definitions. (This does not mean, however, that there should be a single definition for the state. Definitions should be related to the varying educational needs throughout the state and to the institutional resources which can be provided.)

2. Performance expectations or criteria. The design of preparation experiences should spell out the specific performance criteria (standards) which are appropriate to the particular professional role being prepared (see role definition above). These sets of performance criteria, one set for each role, are to be written and agreed upon by the colleges, school organizations and professional associations involved in establishing a preparation program. The criteria or expectations should be viewed in terms of observable behavior in two general categories: (a) those behaviors which occur when the person is practicing his professional specialization on-the-job at various stages of development; and (b) those knowledges, talents, and personal characteristics which are needed so that the behaviors in (a) can occur. It is understood that performance criteria will be redefined and rewritten as preparation arrangements are initiated and carried forward.

   Agencies drafting performance criteria may wish to use the following sequence:

   a. Determine the criteria which are to be applied in recommending a person for the Continuing certificate. These criteria should be consistent with career-level achievement in relation to the role definition above.

   b. From this list, determine which performance expectations (and at what criterion levels) should be applied in recommending a person for the Initial certificate.

   c. From this determination, decide on what performance criteria will be applied for issuance of the Preparatory certificate.

d. Based upon the total career development outlined above, determine what criteria shall be applied to selection and recruitment efforts.

e. Determine the performance criteria to be used in recommending a person for the Consultant certificate. These criteria should be considered as additional to those listed for the Continuing certificate.

3. Development of tasks. With a given set of performance criteria, the preparation program should be organized into tasks--tasks which are designed to result in the teaching behavior defined as desirable by the agencies involved or responsible for preparation. Tasks should be varied and variable for each performance criterion (or combination of criteria) listed. Tasks need to be defined in relation to the materials and facilities available (see below); the variety of student talents and perceptions being confronted by them (see below); as well as by the specific performance criteria defined.

   Preparation traditionally has consisted of a number of assignments and requirements; these assignments literally have been learning tasks. These revised standards ask that tasks be organized in relation to performance objectives and that these tasks be used as the foci for sound learning sequences.

4. Organization of materials and facilities. At the same time that performance tasks are established, the appropriate contexts for learning specific behaviors need to be found or created. Some tasks can be accomplished on the college campus using peers or stimulated situations; some tasks require real children in real classrooms. For example, the teaching of permissive teacher behavior requires the availability of permissive schools. Tasks and facilities have constraining effects on possible teacher education sequences and designs.

5. Models of performance. Models of people performing the specific behaviors defined as desirable need to be available to students in preparation. Models may be live or on tape or film. In any case, models should show (1) a variety of styles or ways of completing the specific task assigned, and (2) different levels of performance in accomplishing the same task by the same person. (It is important to learn that there is no one way to accomplish a teaching, administrative, or counseling task, and that human beings do not work at their peak efficiency or skill all the time. Models should serve to introduce variety and diversity in task accomplishment. The total set of experiences should encourage the practitioner to take on new or additional ways of carrying out his assigned tasks. The more performance alternatives (varying responses) he has, the more potential freedom he has.

6. Assessment of readiness. Before specific tasks are ordered for a particular student, an assessment should be made of his readiness and willingness to undertake such tasks. Assessment should be based upon the performance criteria established. Experience and research should refine performance readiness measures as new experience adds to the present level of knowledge.

7. Ordering of tasks. Different students will require different ordering tasks and different timing or pacing. Variation in task assignment is one evidence of individualization in preparation. Students should assume responsibility for ordering preparation tasks for themselves before they complete requirements for career (continuing) certification.

8. Scheduling tasks. Because the sequence of tasks to be undertaken may vary, and the length and number of experiences within the accomplishment of a given task also may vary for each individual, scheduling programs on an individual basis become complex. Scheduling often is as dependent upon the availability of facilities and equipment as it is upon the readiness of students to move ahead. Agencies responsible for preparation may need to redeploy resources in order to schedule experiences meaningfully.

9. Provision for feedback. Each time a task is undertaken by a student, some provision needs to be made for feedback. Feedback consists of having the student see, hear, or feel himself as he is (or was) while performing a task, and concurrently see, hear, or feel how others reacted to his performance. Feedback may have evaluative overtones (it usually does to the person involved because he has expectations for himself), but it may be designed to avoid assessment and evaluation by others. Next tasks need to be ordered in relation to feedback from working on previous tasks. Individualization in ordering and scheduling tasks for students is dependent upon accurate and timely feedback. Feedback serves as the key motivational element in self-improvement programs.

10. Recommendation and placement. As a person succeeds in mastering the performance expectations established by his preparing agencies, a recommendation for the issuance of the appropriate certificate will be made. Recommendation for certification involves an additional responsibility--it involves the recommendation of an appropriate placement. Appropriateness of placement includes consideration of the individual's specialized preparation, his teaching style, his performance achievement, etc.

    Placement should consider both the present readiness or preparation the person has to handle the contemplated assignment, and the nature of the opportunities for further growth inherent in the contemplated assignment. In other words, placement and career development are inseparable and should be planned and recommended together whenever possible.

Career considerations

Professional preparation is a blending of the theoretical and practical; of reflection and action; of the getting ready to do and the doing. Preparation and career planning involving the academic world of the university needs to be related to the world of the practitioner and vice versa. To assume that academic experiences need to occur prior to practical experiences in all cases, is unwise. Professional career development may be viewed as a series of careers. For example, a person may begin working in a school as a school service aide and, as a result of his experience, begin studying to become a fully qualified

teacher. He may reach his goal, or he may, for a number of reasons, become an instructional assistant only. He may have been issued an Initial certificate, but in the course of his internship experiences, was unable to master all of the performance expectations required by his preparing agencies.

Programmatic plans for an individual should be based upon the criteria established and the perceptions and judgments of qualified personnel in the teacher education agencies involved. Decisions about competence or the ability of a person to perform specific behaviors (or respond to certain tasks) need to be made by those most knowledgeable of the person's activities. Career development, therefore, requires both the confrontation of the person with his own actions, and confrontations with professional colleagues who care and who are present on the scene.

Since learning and career development are not linear and apparently not orderly, wide variations in individual style and teaching procedures should be encouraged. Because teachers, as they grow older, continue to learn and to change while their students tend to remain at the same age, different styles and procedures need to be developed, just as different meanings or concepts need to be taught. Career development preparation experiences should be aimed at helping the teacher, administrator, and educational staff associate, meet his needs as he perceives them; of helping him communicate with students and others more effectively; of helping him develop more performance alternatives and resources throughout the length of his career.

The fulfillment of professional staff development is the improvement of student performance. Planners of professional preparation experiences need to relate their plans with the learning experiences provided for children and youth in schools.

COORDINATION OF PREPARATION

The involvement of several different kinds of agencies in the preparation of the professional worker necessitates coordination of their efforts. In some situations and at certain certificate levels, the coordinating responsibility is apparent and logical as a result of present practices; in others new arrangements are required.

The Preparatory certificate presents no special coordination problems. The person who becomes eligible for the Preparatory certificate is clearly identified with a college or university; school organizations and professional associations see him as a college student.

The Initial certificate holder, on the other hand, is neither a college student nor a full-fledged practitioner. Requirements from the college could interfere with his learning to perform; similarly, full-time responsibilities (load) applied by the school organization could interfere with optimum learning.

The Continuing certificate presents no new coordination problems. Upon issuance of the certificate, the holder is recognized as a fully qualified practitioner. There will need to be coordination of the efforts of preparation agencies to assist him in his continuing career development.

The processes and procedures used in recommending persons for Consultant certificates and the assignment of such personnel in working with student teachers and interns, require additional coordination. The identification of potential instructional leaders and their preparation and utilization require that colleges, school organizations and professional associations be responsibly involved in these processes.

Personnel Involved in Staff Development

As teacher education agencies assume responsibility for staff development, personnel need to be designated to carry out the accepted responsibilities and functions. As professional preparation is extended in time and as additional agencies are involved, additional teacher education personnel roles will be required. The following roles (role titles or role definitions) appear necessary for the administration of adequate career development programs:

Colleges:

(1) Someone who coordinates pre-service laboratory experiences (including observation, participation and student teaching) and helps bring together placement recommendations.

(2) Someone who coordinates field services, including placement, follow-up, extension and in-service offerings for the college.

School Organizations:

(3) Someone who coordinates pre-service laboratory experiences undertaken within the school organization. This person (or persons) should deal with requests for participation experiences in the school organization, and should work to expand pre-service laboratory experience opportunities.

(4) Someone who coordinates the intern and in-service preparation experiences made available in the school organization, with the personnel development needs of the school organization.

Professional Associations (general and specialized):

(5) Someone who coordinates pre-service professional experiences for an association; that is, someone who speaks for the profession regarding selection, recruitment, and induction of prospective professional personnel; someone who focuses attention on the nature and extent of opportunities for pre-service preparation; someone who communicates programmatic developments to and from the profession.

(6) Someone who coordinates in-service training experiences; that is, someone who speaks for the profession regarding the internship and consultant programs; someone who focuses attention on self-renewal programs for holders of continuing certificates; someone who communicates programmatic developments to and from the profession.

Staff Development Coordination

Coordination of the professional preparation activities among the agencies may be accomplished through a Staff Development Coordinator (SDC) who is designated to work with one or more school organizations, one or more colleges, and one or more professional associations, in the preparation of persons for one or more professional roles. Staff Development Coordinators will be persons employed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as needed.

Duties of Staff Development Coordinators include: developing and maintaining effective communication among and between the personnel responsible for teacher education (listed above); helping in program development and evaluation; organizing and calling together committees to ensure appropriate collaboration among the agencies; coordinating procedures used for developing individual recommendations for certification. (Recommendations will be forwarded through the SDC.) Normally the office for a SDC will be located in one of the school organizations making up a cluster of preparation agencies.

The development of adequate coordination of professional preparation experiences will take time. Pilot projects during the next three years should provide knowledge about how coordination may occur and, at the same time, help prepare personnel to assume responsibility for preparation programs under these standards. There is no preconceived plan for bringing together particular school organizations with particular colleges or universities, or professional association. Eventually all areas of the state, however, will be included in preparation arrangements.

Personnel in colleges, school organizations, and professional associations are encouraged to begin planning staff development programs on an inter-agency basis immediately, consistent with their own purposes and needs. The processes and procedures outlined in this document provide a planning framework.

PROGRAM APPROVAL AND REVIEW

The preparation programs of teacher education agencies are subject to approval by the State Board of Education.

The State Board will approve a program of professional preparation which:

1. Is based upon an analysis and a description of the performance expectations for the particular professional role for which the program is designed. Because roles change as new knowledge is created, analyses and descriptions of performance need to be revised periodically.

2. Provides for inter-institutional collaboration; that is, the program is conceived and developed by three types of agencies--colleges, school organizations, and professional associations.

3. Corresponds with and is based upon the current and projected personnel needs of the state.

4. Is individualized; that is, individual needs are cared for and the individual talents of persons are nurtured; learning tasks are chosen or assigned as a consequence of an individual's readiness to perform.

5. Provides frequent and periodic feedback to participants re their performance.

6. Is offered by agencies which have the human and material resources required to field the proposed program.

7. Is offered by agencies which provide frequent and periodic performance feedback to their own faculties.

8. Is offered by agencies which have worked out an agreed upon system for recommending persons for changes in certification.

9. Is offered by agencies which have on file with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction a description of the program based on these standards and the items listed in "Preparation," above.

Following initial approval of programs, teacher education agencies are to file annual progress reports together with descriptions of changes in programs and the resources committed to them.

A comprehensive review of teacher education programs and renewal of State Board of Education approval of a program will be on a three to five-year schedule. The review will include visitation and meeting with the key people involved in offering programs, by committees of highly qualified professional personnel (State Liaison Committee).